arXiv:1408.4198v1 [math.CO] 19 Aug 2014

3-Factor-criticality in double domination edge critical graphs*

Haichao Wang[1], Erfang Shan[2]†, Yancai Zhao[3]

[1]School of Mathematics and Physics, Shanghai University of Electric Power, Shanghai 200090, China

[2]School of Management, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200444, China

[3]Department of Basic Science, Wuxi City College of Vocational Technology, Jiangsu 214153, China

Abstract

A vertex subset S of a graph G is a double dominating set of G if $|N[v] \cap S| \geq 2$ for each vertex v of G, where $N[v]$ is the set of the vertex v and vertices adjacent to v. The double domination number of G, denoted by $\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$, is the cardinality of a smallest double dominating set of G. A graph G is said to be double domination edge critical if $\gamma_{\times 2}(G+e) < \gamma_{\times 2}(G)$ for any edge $e \notin E$. A double domination edge critical graph G with $\gamma_{\times 2}(G) = k$ is called k-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical. A graph G is r-factor-critical if $G - S$ has a perfect matching for each set S of r vertices in G. In this paper we show that G is 3-factor-critical if G is a 3-connected claw-free 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph of odd order with minimum degree at least 4 except a family of graphs.

Keywords: Matching; 3-Factor-criticality; Double domination edge critical graphs, Claw-free

MSC: 05C69, 05C70

*This research was partially supported by the National Nature Science Foundation of China (No. 11171207), the Nature Science Foundation of Shanghai (No. 14ZR1417900) and the Key Programs of Wuxi City College of Vocational Technology(WXCY-2012-GZ-007).

†Corresponding author. Email address: efshan@shu.edu.cn (E. Shan)

1 Introduction

Recently, the matching and factor properties in critical graphs with respect to domination have received more attention (see, [1-5, 7, 10, 14-15, 21-24]). A graph G is *r-factor-critical* if $G - S$ has a perfect matching for each set S of r vertices in G. If $r = 1$, the graph is said to be *factor-critical* and if $r = 2$, the graph G is called *bicritical*. A *double dominating set* (DDS) of G is defined in [12] as a subset S of $V(G)$ such that $|N[v] \cap S| \geq 2$ for every vertex v of G, where $N[v]$ is the set of the vertex v and vertices adjacent to v in G. The *double domination number* $\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$ of G is the cardinality of a smallest double dominating set of G. A graph G is called *double domination edge critical*, or just *$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical*, if $\gamma_{\times 2}(G + e) < \gamma_{\times 2}(G)$ for each edge $e \notin E(G)$. If $\gamma_{\times 2}(G) = k$, a $\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph is said to be *k-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical*. In [22, 23] the matching properties of double domination edge critical graphs were investigated, we proved that G has a perfect matching if G is a connected $K_{1,4}$-free 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph of even order ≥ 6 with an exceptional family of graphs; G is bicritical if G is either a 2-connected claw-free 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical of even order with minimum degree at least 3 or a 3-connected $K_{1,4}$-free 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph of even order with minimum degree at least 4. In this paper we show that G is 3-factor-critical if G is a 3-connected claw-free 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph of odd order with minimum degree at least 4 except a family of graphs.

For notation and graph theory terminology we in general follow [8]. Specifically, let G be a finite simple graph with *vertex set* $V(G)$ and *edge set* $E(G)$. For a vertex $v \in V(G)$, the *open neighborhood* of v is $N(v) = \{u \in V(G) \colon uv \in E(G)\}$ and the *closed neighborhood* of v is $N[v] = \{v\} \cup N(v)$. The *degree* of v in G, denoted by $d(v)$, is the cardinality of $N(v)$. Let $\delta(G)$ represent the *minimum degree* of G. As usual, $K_{m,n}$ denotes a complete bipartite graph with classes of cardinality m and n; K_n is the complete graph on n vertices, and C_n is the cycle on n vertices. For $S \subseteq V(G)$, the subgraph of G induced by S is denoted by $G[S]$. A graph G is said to be *$K_{1,r}$-free* if it contains no $K_{1,r}$ as an induced subgraph. In particular, $K_{1,3}$-free is also called *claw-free*. The *complement* of G, denoted by $\overline{G}$, is the graph with vertex set $V(G)$ such that two vertices are adjacent in $\overline{G}$ if and only if the vertices are not adjacent in G. The *diameter* of G is the greatest distance between two vertices of G, denoted by $\mathrm{diam}(G)$. A *cutset* of a connected G is a subset S of $V(G)$ such that $G - S$ is disconnected. For $S \subseteq V(G)$, we shall denote by $\omega(G - S)$, the number of components of $G - S$ and by $o(G - S)$, the number of odd components of $G - S$. A subset S of $V(G)$ is called an *independent set* of G if no two vertices of S are adjacent in G. The *independence number* of G, denoted by $\alpha(G)$, is the cardinality of a largest independent set of G. A set of pairwise independent edges in G is called a *matching* of G. A matching is *perfect* if it is incident with every vertex of G.

For a fixed positive integer k, a *k-tuple dominating set* of G is a subset S of $V(G)$ such that $|N[v] \cap S| \geq k$ for every vertex $v \in V(G)$. The *k-tuple domination number* $\gamma_{\times k}(G)$ of G is the minimum cardinality of a k-tuple dominating set of G. In particular, when $k = 1, 2$, 1-tuple domination and 2-tuple domination are the ordinary domination and double domination, respectively. The concept of k-tuple domination in graphs was introduced and studied in [12]. For more results on the k-tuple domination, we refer to [6, 9, 11-13, 16-18, 19-21, 25].

2 Preliminaries

In this section we state some results that are useful in the proof of our main results. For an edge $uv \in E(\overline{G})$, we shall denote by D_{uv} a minimum double dominating set (MDDS) of $G+uv$ throughout this paper.

By the definition of $\gamma_{\times 2}$-criticality, the following observation follows immediately.

Observation 1. *If G is a $\gamma_{\times 2}$-critical graph and $uv \in E(\overline{G})$, then D_{uv} contains at least one of u and v. Furthermore, if $\gamma_{\times 2}(G+uv) = \gamma_{\times 2}(G) - 2$, then D_{uv} contains both u and v.*

Lemma 1. ([21]) *If G is a connected 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph, then $diam(G) \in \{2, 3\}$.*

Lemma 2. ([21]) *A graph G with $diam(G) = 3$ is 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical if and only if G is the sequential join $K_1 + K_s + K_t + K_1$ for positive integers s and t.*

The *sequential join*, as defined by Akiyama and Harary, for three or more disjoint graphs $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_n$, denoted by $G_1 + G_2 + \cdots + G_n$, is the graph $(G_1 + G_2) \cup (G_2 + G_3) \cup \cdots \cup (G_{n-1} + G_n)$, where $G_i + G_{i+1}$ is obtained from $G_i \cup G_{i+1}$ by joining each vertex of G_i to each vertex of G_{i+1} for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.

In [23] Wang and Shan proved the following two results.

Lemma 3. ([23]) *If G is a connected $K_{1,r}$-free ($k \geq 3$) 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph, then $\alpha(G) \leq r$.*

Lemma 4. ([23]) *Let G be a connected 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph and S a cutset of G. If $\omega(G - S) \geq 3$ and x and y belong to different components of $G - S$, then $|D_{xy} \cap \{x, y\}| = 1$ and $|D_{xy}| = 3$.*

By Observation 1, we immediately have the following lemma.

Lemma 5. *Let G be a connected 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph and S a cutset of G. If $\omega(G - S) = 2$ and each component has at least two vertices, and x and y lie in different components of $G - S$, then $|D_{xy}| = 3$ and $D_{xy} \cap S \neq \emptyset$.*

Furthermore, the following results are useful in the proof of our main result. The first result is proved by Wang and Kang in [22] and the second result is due to Favaron [10].

Theorem 1. ([22]) *If G is a connected $K_{1,4}$-free 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph of odd order and $\delta(G) \geq 2$, then G is factor-critical.*

Theorem 2. ([10]) *A graph G is k-factor-critical if and only if $o(G-S) \leq |S| - k$ for every $S \subseteq V(G)$ and $|S| \geq k$.*

3 Main result

In this section we shall show that G is 3-factor-critical if G is a 3-connected claw-free 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph of odd order with minimum degree at least 4 except a family $\mathcal{H}$ of graphs.

For convenience, let us introduce more notation and terminology. If $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a minimum double dominating set (DDS) of G, we call S a $\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-set. For a vertex $v \in V(G)$, v is said to be *doubly dominated* by S if $|N[v] \cap S| \geq 2$. For $A, B \subseteq V(G)$, we say that A is *doubly dominated* by B, written $B \succ_{\times 2} A$, if each vertex of A is doubly dominated by B. Furthermore, we use $B \not\succ_{\times 2} A$ to present that A is not doubly dominated by B.

Lemma 6. *Let G be a 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph of odd order with $\delta(G) \geq 4$. If diam$(G) = 3$, then G is 3-factor-critical.*

Proof. If diam$(G) = 3$, then, by Lemma 2, G is isomorphic to a sequential join $K_1 + K_s + K_t + K_1$ for positive integers s and t. Since $\delta(G) \geq 4$ and G has odd order, it follows that $s \geq 4$ and $t \geq 4$. Further, s and t must have different parities. It is easy to check that $G - D$ has a perfect matching for each set D of 3 vertices in G. So the assertion holds. □

Lemma 7. *Let G be a 3-connected claw-free 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph of odd order with $\delta(G) \geq 4$. If G is not 3-factor-critical, then there exists a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $|S| = 3$ and $G - S$ contains exactly two odd components.*

Proof. Since G is not 3-factor-critical, there exists a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ with $|S| \geq 3$ such that $o(G-S) > |S| - 3$ by Theorem 2. But, by Theorem 1, G is factor-critical, and so $o(G-S) \leq |S| - 1$. Note that $|V(G)|$ is odd, so $o(G-S) = |S| - 1$ by parity. Thus $|S| \leq 4$ by Lemma 3. Since G is 3-connected, $3 \leq |S| \leq 4$.

If $|S| = 4$, by Lemma 3, then $G - S$ has no even components and $\omega(G-S) = 3$. Let $S = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4\}$. Choose $a \in V(C_1)$ and $b \in V(C_2)$. Now consider the graph $G + ab$. By

Lemma 4, $|D_{ab} \cap \{a, b\}| = 1$ and $|D_{ab}| = 3$. Without loss of generality, assume that $a \in D_{ab}$. In order to doubly dominate $V(C_2) \cup V(C_3)$, $1 \leq |D_{ab} \cap S| \leq 2$. If $|D_{ab} \cap S| = 2$, without loss of generality, say $u_1, u_2 \in D_{ab}$, then each vertex of $V(C_2) \cup V(C_3) - \{b\}$ is adjacent to both u_1 and u_2. Moreover, b is adjacent to only one of u_1 and u_2 for otherwise $\{a, u_1, u_2\}$ would be a DDS of G, a contradiction. Then $|V(C_2)| \geq 3$ as $d(b) \geq \delta(G) \geq 4$. Since $D_{ab} = \{a, u_1, u_2\}$ is a $\gamma_{\times 2}(G + ab)$-set, a is adjacent to at least one of u_1 and u_2. This implies that G contains a claw centered at u_1 or u_2, a contradiction. Hence $|D_{ab} \cap S| = 1$. This implies that $|D_{ab} \cap V(C_3)| = 1$ and $V(C_2) = \{b\}$. Without loss of generality, let $u_1 \in D_{ab}$ and $c \in D_{ab}$ where $c \in V(C_3)$. Then $G[\{u_1, a, b, c\}]$ is a claw in G, a contradiction. Therefore, $|S| \leq 3$. Then we have $|S| = 3$. Moreover, since S is a minimum cutset of G, it follows that each vertex of S is adjacent to a vertex of each component of $G - S$. Recall that G is claw-free. Thus $G - S$ has no even components, and so $G - S$ contains exactly two odd components. $\square$

Let G be defined as that in Lemma 7, $S = \{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ and $\{C_1, C_2\}$ be two odd components of $G - S$. Since $\delta(G) \geq 4$, $|V(C_1)| \geq 3$ and $|V(C_2)| \geq 3$. Now set $A_i = V(C_1) \cap N(s_i)$ and $B_i = V(C_2) \cap N(s_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$. We have the following lemma.

Lemma 8. *Let G be a 3-connected claw-free 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph of odd order with $\delta(G) \geq 4$. If G is not 3-factor-critical and diam$(G) = 2$, then the following statements are true:*
(1) *For $1 \leq i \leq 3$, $A_i \neq \emptyset$ and $B_i \neq \emptyset$. Furthermore, both $G[A_i]$ and $G[B_i]$ are complete;*
(2) *$V(C_1) = \cup_{i=1}^{3} A_i$ and $V(C_2) = \cup_{i=1}^{3} B_i$;*
(3) *There exists at least a pair of A_i and A_j such that $A_i \cap A_j \neq \emptyset$, where $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 3$;*
(4) *There exists at least a pair of B_i and B_j such that $B_i \cap B_j \neq \emptyset$, where $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 3$.*

Proof. (1) The statement (1) directly follows, because G is claw-free and S is a minimum cutset of G.

(2) Suppose not, without loss of generality, let $V(C_1) \neq \cup_{i=1}^{3} A_i$. Thus there exists a vertex $u \in V(C_1) - \cup_{i=1}^{3} A_i$. Take any vertex $v \in V(C_2)$. Clearly, the distance between u and v is more than 2, which contradicts our assumption that diam$(G) = 2$. So the statement (2) holds.

(3) Suppose to the contrary that $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 3$. Choose $a_1 \in A_1$ and $b_1 \in B_1$. By Observation 1, $1 \leq |D_{a_1b_1} \cap \{a_1, b_1\}| \leq 2$. If $|D_{a_1b_1} \cap \{a_1, b_1\}| = 2$, by Lemma 5, then $D_{a_1b_1} \cap S = \{s_1\}$ as $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 3$. However, A_2 and A_3 are not doubly dominated by $D_{a_1b_1}$, a contradiction. Hence $|D_{a_1b_1} \cap \{a_1, b_1\}| = 1$. If $b_1 \in D_{a_1b_1}$, then $s_1 \in D_{a_1b_1}$, so that a_1 can be doubly dominated. But this implies that A_2 and A_3 can not be doubly dominated by $D_{a_1b_1}$, a contradiction. Thus $a_1 \in D_{a_1b_1}$. Clearly, $1 \leq |D_{a_1b_1} \cap S| \leq 2$. If $|D_{a_1b_1} \cap S| = 1$, then $s_1 \in D_{a_1b_1}$ because $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 3$. To doubly dominate

$V(C_2) - \{b_1\}$, we have $|D_{a_1b_1} \cap (V(C_2) - \{b_1\})| = 1$. Let $x \in D_{a_1b_1} \cap (V(C_2) - \{b_1\})$. Then $s_1x \in E(G)$. By Claim 1, $D_{a_1b_1}$ is also a DDS of G, a contradiction. Hence $|D_{a_1b_1} \cap S| = 2$. Since $a_1s_2, a_1s_3 \notin E(G)$, $s_1 \in D_{a_1b_1}$. Without loss of generality, assume that $s_2 \in D_{a_1b_1}$. For a vertex $a_3 \in A_3$, then a_3 is adjacent to at least one of s_1 and s_2 to doubly dominate a_3. This implies that $A_1 \cap A_3 \neq \emptyset$ or $A_2 \cap A_3 \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. So the statement (3) follows.

(4) We can show that the statement is also true by a similar argument that used in the proof of the statement (3). □

The family $\mathcal{H}$ of graphs is defined as follows: For odd integer $r \geq 3$, let $H_1 = K_r$, $H_2 = K_3$ and $H_3 = K_1 \cup K_2$. Let $H_{r,3,3}$ be the graph obtained from $(H_1 + H_3) \cup H_2$ by adding 6 edges between $V(H_2)$ and $V(H_3)$ such that each vertex of H_2 has exactly 2 neighbors in H_3 while each vertex of H_3 has precisely 2 neighbors in H_2. By our construction, it is easy to verified that $H_{r,3,3}$ is a 3-connected claw-free 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}$-critical graphs of odd order with minimum degree 4. Obviously, $H_{r,3,3} - V(H_3)$ has no perfect matching, hence $H_{r,3,3}$ is not 3-factor-critical. Let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_{r,3,3} \colon\ r \geq 3 \text{ is an odd integer}\}$.

Lemma 9. *Let G be a 3-connected claw-free 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph of odd order with $\delta(G) \geq 4$ and $diam(G) = 2$. If G is not 3-factor-critical and $G \notin \mathcal{H}$, then both $\cap_{i=1}^{3} A_i = \emptyset$ and $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let S, C_1 and C_2 be defined as before. Suppose not, without loss of generality, let $\cap_{i=1}^{3} A_i \neq \emptyset$. Take $a \in \cap_{i=1}^{3} A_i$. By Lemma 8 (1), $N[a] = S \cup V(C_1)$. We claim that $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = \emptyset$. Otherwise, there exists a vertex $b \in \cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i$. Consider $G + ab$. By Observation 1, without loss of generality, assume that $a \in D_{ab}$. If $b \in D_{ab}$, then $|D_{ab} \cap S| = 1$ by Lemma 5, so D_{ab} is also a DDS of G because a and b are adjacent to every vertex of S, a contradiction. Thus $b \notin D_{ab}$. Since $D_{ab} \succ_{\times 2} S \cup (V(C_2) - \{b\})$, $|D_{ab} \cap (S \cup (V(C_2) - \{b\}))| = 2$. Since $b \in \cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i$, D_{ab} is still a DDS of G by Lemma 8 (1), a contradiction. Therefore, $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = \emptyset$. By Lemma 8 (4), we may assume that $B_1 \cap B_2 \neq \emptyset$. Let $x \in B_1 \cap B_2$ and consider the graph $G + ax$.

Case 1. $|D_{ax} \cap \{a, x\}| = 2$.

By Lemma 5, we have $s_3 \in D_{ax}$, and so $D_{ax} = \{a, x, s_3\}$. Then each vertex of $V(C_1) \cup (V(C_2) - \{x\})$ is adjacent to s_3. Choose $b_1 \in V(C_2) - \{x\}$. Now consider $G + ab_1$.

Case 1.1. $|D_{ab_1} \cap \{a, b_1\}| = 2$.

Without loss of generality, suppose that $D_{ab_1} = \{a, s_1, b_1\}$. Then each vertex of $V(C_1)$ is adjacent to s_1 while each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{b_1\}$ is adjacent to both s_1 and b_1. Choose a vertex $u \in V(C_2) - \{x, b_1\}$. This derives that $\{s_1, s_3, u\}$ is a DDS of G, a contradiction. So

$|D_{ab_1} \cap \{a, y_1\}| = 2$ is impossible.

Case 1.2. $|D_{ab_1} \cap \{a, b_1\}| = 1$.

Since $N[a] = V(C_1) \cup S$, we have $a \in D_{ab_1}$ and $b_1 \notin D_{ab_1}$. Assume that $|D_{ab_1} \cap S| = 2$. Then $D_{ab_1} = \{a, s_1, s_3\}$ or $\{a, s_2, s_3\}$ because $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = \emptyset$. However, $D_{ab_1} \not\succ_{\times 2} \{x\}$ as $xs_3 \notin E(G)$, a contradiction. Hence $|D_{ab_1} \cap S| = 1$. Notice that $xs_3 \notin E(G)$. We deduce that $s_1 \in D_{ab_1}$ or $s_2 \in D_{ab_1}$. Without loss of generality, suppose that $s_1 \in D_{ab_1}$. To doubly dominate $V(C_2) - \{b_1\}$, we see that $|D_{ab_1} \cap (V(C_2) - \{b_1\})| = 1$. Let $b_2 \in D_{ab_1} \cap (V(C_2) - \{b_1\})$. Thus each vertex of $V(C_1)$ is adjacent to s_1 while each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{b_1\}$ is adjacent to both s_1 and b_2. If $b_1 s_1 \in E(G)$, then $\{s_1, s_3, b_2\}$ is a DDS of G, a contradiction. So $b_1 s_1 \notin E(G)$. Thus, in order to doubly dominate b_1 in $G + ab_1$, $b_1 b_2 \in E(G)$. This implies that $\{s_1, s_3, b_2\}$ is still a DDS of G, a contradiction again.

Case 2. $|D_{ax} \cap \{a, x\}| = 1$.

If $x \in D_{ax}$, then D_{ax} is also a DDS of G as $N[a] = S \cup V(C_1)$, a contradiction. Hence $a \in D_{ax}$. By Lemma 5, $1 \leq |D_{ax} \cap S| \leq 2$. Suppose that $|D_{ax} \cap S| = 2$. Then $D_{ax} = \{a, s_1, s_3\}$ or $\{a, s_2, s_3\}$. If $D_{ax} = \{a, s_1, s_3\}$, then each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{x\}$ is adjacent to both s_1 and s_3, i.e., $(V(C_2) - \{x\}) \subseteq B_1 \cap B_3$. Since $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = \emptyset$, s_2 is not adjacent to any vertex of $V(C_2) - \{x\}$. Choose $x_1 \in V(C_2) - \{x\}$. Now consider $G + ax_1$. If $|D_{ax_1} \cap \{a, x_1\}| = 2$, then $D_{ax_1} = \{a, s_2, x_1\}$ by Lemma 5, however, $D_{ax_1} \not\succ_{\times 2} V(C_2) - \{x, x_1\}$. So $|D_{ax_1} \cap \{a, x_1\}| = 1$. Since $N[a] = S \cup V(C_1)$, $x_1 \notin D_{ax_1}$. Then $a \in D_{ax_1}$. To doubly dominate $V(C_2) - \{x, x_1\}$, it follows that $s_2 \notin D_{ax_1}$ and $|D_{ax_1} \cap \{s_1, s_3\} \cup (V(C_2) - x_1)| = 2$. Then, since $V(C_2) = B_1$ and $G[B_1]$ is complete, D_{ax_1} is a DDS of G, this is a contradiction. If $D_{ax} = \{a, s_2, s_3\}$, then we can reach a contradiction by similar arguments. This implies that $|D_{ax} \cap S| = 2$ is impossible. Hence $|D_{ax} \cap S| = 1$. Suppose D_{ax} contains s_1 or s_2. Then $|D_{ax} \cap (V(C_2) - \{x\})| = 1$, so that $V(C_2) - \{x\}$ can be doubly dominated. Let $x_2 \in D_{ax} \cap (V(C_2) - \{x\})$. Clearly, $xx_2 \notin E(G)$ for otherwise D_{ax} would be a DDS of G. But then a claw would occur at s_1 or s_2 in G, a contradiction. Hence, $s_3 \in D_{ax}$. To doubly dominate $V(C_2) - \{x\}$, we have $|D_{ax} \cap (V(C_2) - \{x\})| = 1$. Without loss of generality, let $x_3 \in D_{ax} \cap (V(C_2) - \{x\})$. Then $D_{ax} = \{a, s_3, x_3\}$. Thus $xx_3 \in E(G)$ and each vertex of $V(C_1)$ is adjacent to s_3 while each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{x, x_3\}$ is adjacent to both x_3 and s_3.

Now we consider $G + ax_3$. By Lemma 5, $|D_{ax_3}| = 3$ and $D_{ax_3} \cap S \neq \emptyset$.

Case 2.1. $|D_{ax_3} \cap \{a, x_3\}| = 2$.

In this subcase, we have $|D_{ax_3} \cap \{s_1, s_2\}| = 1$. Without loss of generality, assume that $s_2 \in D_{ax_3}$. Then $D_{ax_3} = \{a, s_2, x_3\}$ and each vertex of $V(C_1)$ is adjacent to s_2 while each

vertex of $V(C_2) - \{x_3\}$ is adjacent to both s_2 and x_3. Furthermore, $s_2x_3 \notin E(G)$. Note that $s_2s_3 \in E(G)$, because $D_{ax} = \{a, s_3, x_3\}$ and D_{ax} doubly dominates s_2 in $G + ax$. Choose $y \in V(C_2) - \{x, x_3\}$ and consider $G + ay$. Suppose $|D_{ay} \cap \{a, y\}| = 1$. Then $a \in D_{ay}$ because $N[a] = S \cup V(C_1)$. If $|D_{ay} \cap S| = 2$, then $D_{ay} = \{a, s_1, s_2\}$ or $\{a, s_1, s_3\}$. If $D_{ay} = \{a, s_1, s_2\}$, then $D_{ay} \not\succ_{\times 2} \{x_3\}$ as $s_2x_3 \notin E(G)$. So $D_{ay} = \{a, s_1, s_3\}$. Since $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = \emptyset$, $xs_3 \notin E(G)$, and so $D_{ay} \not\succ_{\times 2} \{x\}$. Hence $|D_{ay} \cap S| = 1$. By similar arguments above, we obtain $D_{ay} \cap \{s_2, s_3\} = \emptyset$. Hence $s_1 \in D_{ay}$. Since $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = \emptyset$, if $|V(C_2)| \geq 5$, then $D_{ay} \not\succ_{\times 2} V(C_2) - \{x, y, x_3\}$, a contradiction. So $|V(C_2)| = 3$, i.e., $V(C_2) = \{x, y, x_3\}$. To doubly dominate y, we have $|D_{ay} \cap \{x, x_3\}| = 1$. If $x \in D_{ay}$, then $x_3s_1, s_1s_3 \in E(G)$, which implies that S is a DDS of G, a contradiction. Hence $x_3 \in D_{ay}$. To doubly dominate s_2, we see that $s_1s_2 \in E(G)$ as $s_2x_3 \notin E(G)$. This means that S is a DDS of G, a contradiction. Therefore, $|D_{ay} \cap \{a, y\}| = 2$. Then $D_{ay} \cap S = \{s_1\}$ by Lemma 5. Thus each vertex of $V(C_1)$ is adjacent to s_1 while each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{y\}$ is adjacent to both y and s_1. If $|V(C_2)| \geq 5$, then $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. So $|V(C_2)| = 3$, i.e., $V(C_2) = \{x, y, x_3\}$. Clearly, $ys_1 \notin E(G)$. Further, we can obtain $s_1s_2, s_1s_3 \notin E(G)$ for otherwise S would be a DDS of G. By Lemma 8 (1), G is isomorphic to $H_{r,3,3}$, a contradiction. Hence $|D_{ax_3} \cap \{a, x_3\}| = 2$ is impossible.

Case 2.2. $|D_{ax_3} \cap \{a, x_3\}| = 1$.

In this subcase, clearly $a \in D_{ax_3}$ and $x_3 \notin D_{ax_3}$. Since $xs_3, ax \notin E(G)$, $s_3 \notin D_{ax_3}$. If $|D_{ax_3} \cap S| = 2$, then $D_{ax_3} = \{a, s_1, s_2\}$. Thus each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{x, x_3\}$ is adjacent to both s_1 and s_2, and so $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = V(C_2) - \{x, x_3\} \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. Hence $|D_{ax_3} \cap S| = 1$. Without loss of generality, suppose that $s_2 \in D_{ax_3}$. Then each vertex of $V(C_1) \cup (V(C_2) - \{x_3\})$ is adjacent to s_2 and $(V(C_2) - \{x, x_3\}) \subseteq B_2 \cap B_3$. Since x_3 is adjacent to each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{x_3\}$, $s_2x_3 \notin E(G)$ for otherwise D_{ax_3} is a DDS of G. Thus $s_2s_3 \in E(G)$ so that s_2 can be doubly dominated in $G + ax$. Choose $y_1 \in V(C_2) - \{x, x_3\}$ and consider $G + ay_1$. By an argument similar to that as in Case 2.1, one can arrive at a contradiction. Therefore, $|D_{ax_3} \cap \{a, x_3\}| = 1$ is also impossible. □

Theorem 3. *Let G be a 3-connected claw-free 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}(G)$-critical graph of odd order with $\delta(G) \geq 4$. If $G \notin \mathcal{H}$, then G is 3-factor-critical.*

Proof. By Lemma 1, $\mathrm{diam}(G) = 2$ or 3. If $\mathrm{diam}(G) = 3$, then, by Lemma 6, the assertion follows. We may now assume that $\mathrm{diam}(G) = 2$.

Suppose to the contrary that G is not 3-factor-critical. Then there exists a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $|S| = 3$ and $G - S$ contains exactly two odd components by Lemma 7. Let S, C_1 and C_2 be defined as before. By Lemma 8 (3), without loss of generality, suppose that $A_1 \cap A_2 \neq \emptyset$. Further, it follows from Lemma 9 that both $\cap_{i=1}^{3} A_i = \emptyset$ and $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = \emptyset$. Thus there exist i and

j such that $B_i \cap B_j \neq \emptyset$ by Lemma 8 (4), where $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 3$. We next consider the following two subcases.

Case 1. $B_1 \cap B_2 \neq \emptyset$.

Take $a \in A_1 \cap A_2$, $b \in B_1 \cap B_2$, and consider the graph $G + ab$. If $|D_{ab} \cap \{a, b\}| = 2$, then $|D_{ab} \cap S| = 1$ by Lemma 5. Since $\cap_{i=1}^{3} A_i = \emptyset$ and $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = \emptyset$, $D_{ab} \cap S = \{s_1\}$ or $\{s_2\}$. This implies that D_{ab} is a DDS of G, a contradiction. Hence $|D_{ab} \cap \{a, b\}| = 1$. By the symmetry of structure of G, without loss of generality, we may assume that $a \in D_{ab}$ and $b \notin D_{ab}$.

Case 1.1. $|D_{ab} \cap S| = 2$.

Clearly, we have $D_{ab} \cap S = \{s_1, s_3\}$ or $\{s_2, s_3\}$. Because the both cases of $D_{ab} \cap S$ can be discussed similarly, thus we may assume that $D_{ab} \cap S = \{s_1, s_3\}$. Then each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{b\}$ is adjacent to s_1 and s_3. Hence $(V(C_2) - \{b\}) \subseteq B_1 \cap B_3$, and so $V(C_2) = B_1$. Take $b_1 \in V(C_2) - \{b\}$ and consider the graph $G + ab_1$. Clearly, $s_2b_1 \notin E(G)$ as $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = \emptyset$. If $|D_{ab_1} \cap \{a, b_1\}| = 2$, then $|D_{ab_1} \cap S| = 1$ by Lemma 5. Furthermore, note that $D_{ab_1} \cap S = \{s_2\}$ or $\{s_3\}$, because $s_1 \notin D_{ab_1}$. If $s_2 \in D_{ab_1}$, then $(V(C_2) - \{b, b_1\}) \subseteq \cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. So $s_3 \in D_{ab_1}$. But, $D_{ab_1} \not\succ \{b\}$ as $ab \notin E(G)$ and $bs_3 \notin E(G)$, a contradiction. Therefore, $|D_{ab_1} \cap \{a, b_1\}| = 1$.

Suppose $a \in D_{ab_1}$ and $b_1 \notin D_{ab_1}$. If $|D_{ab_1} \cap S| = 2$, then $s_2 \in D_{ab_1}$. However, $D_{ab_1} \not\succ V(C_2) - \{b, b_1\}$ as $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = \emptyset$. So $|D_{ab_1} \cap S| = 1$. By Lemma 5, in order to doubly dominate $V(C_2) - \{b_1\}$, we have $|D_{ab_1} \cap (V(C_2) - \{b_1\})| = 1$. Note that $s_3 \notin D_{ab_1}$, since $as_3 \notin E(G)$. Recall that $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = \emptyset$. If $s_2 \in D_{ab_1}$, then $D_{ab_1} \not\succ V(C_2) - \{b, b_1\}$. Hence $s_1 \in D_{ab_1}$. It immediately follows from Lemma 8 (1) that $G[B_1] = G[V(C_2)]$ is complete. This implies that D_{ab_1} is also a DDS of G, a contradiction. Therefore, $a \notin D_{ab_1}$ and $b_1 \in D_{ab_1}$. Suppose $|D_{ab_1} \cap S| = 2$. Then $D_{ab_1} \cap S = \{s_1, s_3\}$ or $\{s_2, s_3\}$. Note that $s_2b_1 \notin E(G)$. If $D_{ab_1} \cap S = \{s_1, s_3\}$, then $s_2s_1, s_2s_3 \in E(G)$ to doubly dominate s_2. This means that S is a DDS of G, a contradiction. So $D_{ab_1} \cap S = \{s_2, s_3\}$. To doubly dominate s_2 and s_1, $s_2s_3 \in E(G)$ and s_1 is adjacent to at least one of s_2 and s_3, respectively. This implies that S is a DDS of G, a contradiction. Hence $|D_{ab_1} \cap S| = 1$. To doubly dominate $V(C_1) - \{a\}$, we see that $|D_{ab_1} \cap (V(C_1) - \{a\})| = 1$ by Lemma 5. Since $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = \emptyset$, $bs_3 \notin E(G)$. Then $s_3 \notin D_{ab_1}$. Recall that $s_2b_1 \notin E(G)$. Then $s_2 \notin D_{ab_1}$. So $s_1 \in D_{ab_1}$. Thus $V(C_1) = A_1$. By Lemma 8 (1), $G[V(C_1)]$ is complete, which implies that D_{ab_1} is a DDS of G, a contradiction. Hence Case 1.1 can not occur.

Case 1.2. $|D_{ab} \cap S| = 1$.

Since $\cap_{i=1}^{3} A_i = \emptyset$, $as_3 \notin E(G)$. Then $D_{ab} \cap S = \{s_1\}$ or $\{s_2\}$. Suppose $D_{ab} \cap S = \{s_1\}$. To doubly dominate $V(C_2) - \{b\}$, we have $|D_{ab} \cap (V(C_2) - \{b\})| = 1$ by Lemma 5. Then each

vertex of $V(C_2)$ is adjacent to s_1. Thus $V(C_2) = B_1$. By Lemma 8 (1), $G[V(C_2)]$ is complete. This means that D_{ab} is a DDS of G, a contradiction. So $D_{ab} \cap S = \{s_2\}$. By a similar argument, one reaches the same contradiction. Therefore, Case 1.2 is impossible.

Case 2. $B_1 \cap B_3 \neq \emptyset$ or $B_2 \cap B_3 \neq \emptyset$.

Suppose first that $B_1 \cap B_3 \neq \emptyset$. Choose $u \in A_1 \cap A_2$ and $v \in B_1 \cap B_3$. Now consider $G + uv$. We distinguish the following two subcases.

Case 2.1. $|D_{uv} \cap \{u, v\}| = 2$.

Then $|D_{uv} \cap S| = 1$ by Lemma 5. Clearly, $s_1 \notin D_{uv}$. Thus $D_{uv} \cap S = \{s_2\}$ or s_3. First suppose $D_{uv} \cap S = \{s_2\}$. Then each vertex of $V(C_1)$ is adjacent to s_2 while each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{v\}$ is adjacent to s_2 and v. By Lemma 8 (1), $G[V(C_1)] = G[A_2]$ is complete. Choose $v_1 \in V(C_2) - \{v\}$ and consider $G + uv_1$. If $|D_{uv_1} \cap \{u, v_1\}| = 2$, then $|D_{uv_1} \cap S| = 1$. Obviously, $s_2 \notin D_{uv_1}$. If $s_1 \in D_{uv_1}$, then $(V(C_2) - \{v, v_1\}) \subseteq B_1 \cap B_2$. Thus $B_1 \cap B_2 \neq \emptyset$. By a similar argument that used in the proof of Case 1, one reaches the same contradictions. So $s_1 \notin D_{uv_1}$ and $s_3 \in D_{uv_1}$. Then each vertex in $(V(C_1) - \{u\}) \cup V(C_2)$ is adjacent to s_3. Since $us_3 \notin E(G)$, $s_2s_3 \in E(G)$ to doubly dominate s_3 in $G + uv$. Note that $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = \emptyset$. So $s_1v_1 \notin E(G)$ and $s_1s_3 \in E(G)$ to doubly dominae s_1 in $G + uv_1$. This means that S is a DDS of G, a contradiction. Hence $|D_{uv_1} \cap \{u, v_1\}| = 1$.

Suppose $u \in D_{uv_1}$ and $v_1 \notin D_{uv_1}$. If $|D_{uv_1} \cap S| = 2$, then $s_2 \notin D_{uv_1}$ as $s_2v \notin E(G)$ and $uv \notin E(G)$. Thus $D_{uv_1} = \{u, s_1, s_3\}$ and each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{v, v_1\}$ is adjacent to both s_1 and s_3. Then $(V(C_2) - \{v, v_1\}) \subseteq \cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. So $|D_{uv_1} \cap S| = 1$. To doubly dominate $V(C_2) - \{v_1\}$, we have $|D_{uv_1} \cap (V(C_2) - \{v_1\})| = 1$. Recall that $s_2v \notin E(G)$ and $uv \notin E(G)$. Then $s_2 \notin D_{uv_1}$. Further $s_3 \notin D_{uv_1}$ because $us_3 \notin E(G)$. Thus $s_1 \in D_{uv_1}$. Then each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{v, v_1\}$ is adjacent to s_1, and so $B_1 \cap B_2 \neq \emptyset$. By applying an argument similar to that presented in the proof of Case 1, we can always reach a contradiction. Therefore, $u \notin D_{uv_1}$ and $v_1 \in D_{uv_1}$. If $|D_{uv_1} \cap S| = 2$, then $D_{uv_1} = \{v_1, s_1, s_3\}$ or $\{v_1, s_2, s_3\}$. Suppose $D_{uv_1} = \{v_1, s_1, s_3\}$. Then each vertex of $V(C_1) - \{u\}$ is adjacent to s_1 and s_3, which implies that $\cap_{i=1}^{3} A_i \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. Hence $D_{uv_1} = \{v_1, s_2, s_3\}$. If s_1 is adjacent to a vertex in $V(C_2) - \{v\}$, then $B_1 \cap B_2 \neq \emptyset$. Using a similar argument as in the proof of Case 1, one reaches a contradiction. So s_1 is not adjacent to any vertex in $V(C_2) - \{v\}$. Similarly, s_3 is not adjacent to any vertex in $V(C_2) - \{v\}$. Thus $G - \{s_2, v\}$ is not connected, which contradicts the assumption that G is 3-connected. Hence $|D_{uv_1} \cap S| = 1$. To doubly dominate $V(C_1) - \{u\}$, we have $|D_{uv_1} \cap (V(C_1) - \{u\})| = 1$. Since $G[V(C_1)]$ is complete, $D_{uv_1} \cap \{s_1, s_2\} = \emptyset$ for otherwise D_{uv_1} is a DDS of G. So $s_3 \in D_{uv_1}$. Then $A_2 \cap A_3 \neq \emptyset$ and $B_2 \cap B_3 \neq \emptyset$. By a similar argument that used in the proof of Case 1, we can obtain a contradiction. Hence $D_{uv} \cap S = \{s_2\}$ is

impossible. Similarly, $D_{uv} \cap S = \{s_3\}$ is also impossible. Therefore, Case 2.1 can not occur.

Case 2.2. $|D_{uv} \cap \{u, v\}| = 1$.

Case 2.2.1. $u \in D_{uv}$ and $v \notin D_{uv}$.

If $|D_{uv} \cap S| = 2$, then $D_{uv} = \{u, s_1, s_2\}$ or $\{u, s_2, s_3\}$. Suppose $D_{uv} = \{u, s_1, s_2\}$. Then each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{v\}$ is adjacent to both s_1 and s_2. Thus $B_1 \cap B_2 \neq \emptyset$. By applying an argument similar to that presented in the proof of Case 1, we can obtain a contradiction. So $D_{uv} = \{u, s_2, s_3\}$. Then each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{v\}$ is adjacent to both s_2 and s_3. Thus $(V(C_2) - \{v\}) \subseteq B_2 \cap B_3$ and $G[V(C_2)] = G[B_3]$ is complete by Lemma 8 (1). Since $us_3 \notin E(G)$, $s_2s_3 \in E(G)$. Further, s_1 is adjacent to at least one of s_2 and s_3 because $D_{uv} = \{u, s_2, s_3\} \succ_{\times 2} \{s_1\}$.

Take $v_2 \in V(C_2) - \{v\}$ and consider $G + uv_2$. If $|D_{uv_2} \cap \{u, v_2\}| = 2$, then $|D_{uv_2} \cap S| = 1$. Note that $uv, s_2v \notin E(G)$. So $s_2 \notin D_{uv_2}$. If $s_1 \in D_{uv_2}$, then each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{v, v_2\}$ is adjacent to s_1. Thus $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. Hence $s_1 \notin D_{uv_2}$ and $s_3 \in D_{uv_2}$. Then each vertex of $V(C_1) - \{u\}$ is adjacent to both u and s_3. If there exists a vertex $u^* \in V(C_1) - \{u\}$ such that u^* is adjacent to s_1 or s_2, then $A_1 \cap A_3 \neq \emptyset$ or $A_2 \cap A_3 \neq \emptyset$. Clearly, $B_1 \cap B_3 \neq \emptyset$ and $B_2 \cap B_3 \neq \emptyset$. By a similar argument that used in the proof of Case 1, we can obtain the same contradictions. Hence s_1 and s_2 are not adjacent to any vertex in $V(C_1) - \{u\}$. Thus $G - \{u, s_3\}$ is not connected, contradicting the fact that G is 3-connected. Hence $|D_{uv_2} \cap \{u, v_2\}| = 1$.

Suppose $u \in D_{uv_2}$ and $v_2 \notin D_{uv_2}$. If $|D_{uv_2} \cap S| = 2$, then $D_{uv_2} = \{u, s_1, s_2\}$ or $\{u, s_1, s_3\}$. Since $uv, s_2v \notin E(G)$, $D_{uv_2} = \{u, s_1, s_2\}$ is impossible. So $D_{uv_2} = \{u, s_1, s_3\}$. Then each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{v, v_2\}$ is adjacent to s_1. Recall that $(V(C_2) - \{v\}) \subseteq B_2 \cap B_3$. Thus $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. Hence $|D_{uv_2} \cap S| = 1$. Since D_{uv_2} is a $\gamma_{\times 2}(G + uv_2)$-set, $|D_{uv_2} \cap (V(C_2) - \{v_2\})| = 1$. If $s_2 \in D_{uv_2}$, then $vs_2 \in E(G)$. This derives that $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. Thus $s_2 \notin D_{uv_2}$. Further, $s_3 \notin D_{uv_2}$ as $us_3 \notin E(G)$. So $s_1 \in D_{uv_2}$. Then each vertex of $V(C_2) - \{v, v_2\}$ is adjacent to s_1, which implies that $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. Therefore, $u \notin D_{uv_2}$ and $v_2 \in D_{uv_2}$. If $|D_{uv_2} \cap S| = 2$, then $D_{uv_2} = \{v_2, s_1, s_3\}$ or $\{v_2, s_2, s_3\}$. Thus each vertex of $V(C_1) - \{u\}$ is adjacent to both s_1 and s_3 or both s_2 and s_3, respectively. This means that D_{uv_2} is a DDS of G, a contradiction. Hence $|D_{uv_2} \cap S| = 1$. To doubly dominate $V(C_1) - \{u\}$ in $G + uv_2$, we see that $|D_{uv_2} \cap (V(C_1) - \{u\})| = 1$, say $u^* \in D_{uv_2} \cap (V(C_1) - \{u\})$. It is easy to see that $s_2 \notin D_{uv_2}$ as $s_2v \notin E(G)$ and $u^*v \notin E(G)$. Since $\cap_{i=1}^{3} B_i = \emptyset$, $s_1v_2 \notin E(G)$, and so $s_1 \notin D_{uv_2}$. Therefore, $s_3 \in D_{uv_2}$. Then $s_1u^* \in E(G)$ and $s_3u^* \in E(G)$. Thus $A_1 \cap A_3 \neq \emptyset$. Recall that $v \in B_1 \cap B_3$. By a similar argument that used in the proof of Case 1, we can get the same contradictions. Hence $|D_{uv} \cap S| = 2$ is impossible.

Thus $|D_{uv} \cap S| = 1$. To doubly dominate $V(C_2) - \{v\}$ in $G + uv$, $|D_{uv} \cap (V(C_2) - \{v\})| = 1$, say $v^* \in D_{uv} \cap (V(C_2) - \{v\})$. If $s_1 \in D_{uv}$, then $V(C_2) = B_1$. By Lemma 8 (1), $G[V(C_2)]$ is complete. This implies that D_{uv} is a DDS of G, a contradiction. So $s_1 \notin D_{uv}$. Since $us_3 \notin E(G)$, $s_3 \notin D_{uv}$. Hence $s_2 \in D_{uv}$. Then each vertex of $V(C_1) \cup (V(C_2) - \{v\})$ is adjacent to s_2. Since $D_{uv} \succ_{\times 2} \{s_3\}$, $s_3v^* \in E(G)$. Thus $B_2 \cap B_3 \neq \emptyset$. Further, s_3 is adjacent to a vertex of $V(C_1) - \{u\}$ because $A_3 \neq \emptyset$. So $A_2 \cap A_3 \neq \emptyset$. Using an argument similar to that presented in the proof of Case 1, one reaches the same contradictions. Therefore, Case 2.2.1 is impossible.

Case 2.2.2. $u \notin D_{uv}$ and $v \in D_{uv}$.

By applying a similar argument that used in the proof of Case 2.2.1, we can obtain the same contradictions. So Case 2.2 can not occur. Hence $B_1 \cap B_3 = \emptyset$. Similarly, we can show that $B_2 \cap B_3 = \emptyset$. Thus Case 2 can not occur. This completes the proof of Theorem 3. □



Figure 1: The graph $H_{6,3}$

Remark. The hypotheses on the connectivity and the minimum degree bounds in Theorem 3 are sharp. Indeed, the following results was proved by Favaron in [10]: for all $k \geq 0$, every k-factor-critical graph of order $> k$ is k-(vertex)-connected and for all $k \geq 1$, every k-factor-critical graph of order $> k$ is $(k+1)$-(edge)-connected (and hence has minimum degree at least $k+1$). Next, to illustrate that the assumption on claw-free is necessary, we construct a graph $H_{6,t}$ as follows. For odd integer $t \geq 3$, let $F_1 = K_t$, $F_2 = C_4$ and $F_3 = \overline{K}_2$. Moreover, let $V(F_1) = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots x_t\}$, $V(F_2) = \{y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\}$ and $V(F_3) = \{z_1, z_2\}$. Let $H_{6,t}$ be the graph obtained from the union $F_1 \cup F_2 \cup F_3$ by adding edges x_ty_4 and y_3x_i for $1 \leq i \leq t-1$, joining z_1 to each vertex of $V(F_1) \cup V(F_2)$ and joining z_2 to each vertex of $(V(F_1) \cup V(F_2)) - \{y_4, x_t\}$.

It is easy to see that $H_{6,t}$ is a 4-connected 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}$-critical graph of order $t+6$ with minimum degree 4, but it contains a claw. Obviously, $H_{6,t} - \{u, v, y_4\}$ has no perfect matching. Hence $H_{6,t}$ is not 3-factor-critical. The graph $H_{6,3}$ is shown in Figure 1.

References

[1] N. Ananchuen, W. Ananchuen and M.D. Plummer, Matching properties in connected domination critical graphs, *Discrete Math.* 308 (2008) 1260–1267.

[2] N. Ananchuen, M.D. Plummer, Matching properties in domination critical graphs, *Discrete Math.* 277 (2004) 1–13.

[3] N. Ananchuen, M.D. Plummer, Matchings in 3-vertex-critical graphs: the even case, *Networks* 45 (2005) 210–213.

[4] N. Ananchuen, M.D. Plummer, Matchings in 3-vertex-critical graphs: The odd case, *Discrete Math.* 307 (2007) 1651–1658.

[5] N. Ananchuen, M.D. Plummer, 3-Factor-criticality in domination critical graphs, *Discrete Math.* 307 (2007) 3006–3015.

[6] T. Araki, The k-tuple twin domination in de Bruijn and Kautz digraphs, *Discrete Math.* 308 (2008) 6406–6413.

[7] C. Balbuena, A. Hansberg, New results on 3-domination critical graphs, Aequationes Math. 83 (2012) 57–269.

[8] J.A. Bondy, U.S.R. Murty, *Graph Theory with Applications*, Elsevier North Holland, 1976.

[9] G.J. Chang, The upper bound on k-tuple domination number of graphs, *European J. Combin.* 29 (2008) 1333-1336.

[10] O. Favaron, On k-factor-critical graphs, *Discuss Math. Graph Theory* 16 (1996) 41–51.

[11] A. Gagarin, V.E. Zverovich, A generalised upper bound for the k-tuple domination number, *Discrete Math.* 308 (2008) 880–885.

[12] F. Harary, T.W. Haynes, Double domination in graphs, *Ars Combin.* 55 (2000) 201–213.

[13] F. Harary, T.W. Haynes, Nordhaus-Gaddum inequalities for domination in graphs, *Discrete Math.* 155 (1996) 99–105.

[14] M.A. Henning, A. Yeo, Perfect matchings in total domination critical graphs, Graphs Combin. 27 (2011) 685–701.

[15] S. Khelifi, M. Chellali, Double domination critical and stable graphs upon vertex removal, Discuss. Math. Graph Theory 32 (2012) 643–657.

[16] R. Klasing, C. Laforest, Hardness results and approximation algorithms of k-tuple domination in graphs, *Inform. Process. Lett.* 89 (2004) 75–83.

[17] C.S. Liao, J.A. Chang, Algorithmic aspect of k-tuple domination in graphs, *Taiwanese J. Math.* 6 (2002) 415–420.

[18] C.S. Liao, J.A. Chang, k-Tuple domination in graphs, *Inform. Process. Lett.* 87 (2003) 45–50.

[19] D. Rautenbach, L. Volkmann, New bounds on the k-domination number and the k-tuple domination number, *Appl. Math. Lett.* 20 (2007) 98–102.

[20] E.F. Shan, C.Y. Dang and L.Y. Kang, A note on Nordhaus-Gaddum inequalities for domination, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 136 (2004) 83–85.

[21] D.W. Thacker, Double domination edge critical graphs, Master Thesis, East Tennessee State Univ., May 2006.

[22] H.C. Wang, L.Y. Kang, Matching properties in double domination edge critical graphs, *Discrete Math. Algorithms Appl.* 2 (2010) 151–160.

[23] H.C. Wang, E.F. Shan, Some matching properties in 4-$\gamma_{\times 2}$-critical graphs, *Comput. Math. Appl.* 59 (2010) 694–699.

[24] T. Wang, Q.L. Yu, Factor-critical property in 3-dominating-critical graphs, *Discrete Math.* 309 (2009) 1079–1083.

[25] G.J. Xu, L.Y. Kang, E.F. Shan and H. Yan, Proof of a conjecture on k-tuple domination in graphs, *Appl. Math. Lett.* 21 (2008) 287–290.